

this effort, and global monitors affirmed the legitimate vote of the people that exposed the corruption of the election results.

□ 1200

Shevardnadze's government attempted to ignore the true results, but the Georgian people had a different plan and peacefully forced Shevardnadze to succumb to the will of the people as they stormed the parliament with roses. It was one of the most inspirational episodes of freedom in world history.

Since then, Georgia has enjoyed a period of self-determination, Western engagement, human rights improvements, and trade. This has not been without cost. Separatists in the Georgian districts of Ossetia and Abkhazia, encouraged by Moscow, cast the Republic of Georgia into turmoil. Russia used this unrest as pretext to invade Georgia and still occupies these territories while denouncing earlier agreements to close Russian bases on Georgia's Black Sea coast.

Still, President Mikheil Saakashvili was able to take his rightful place as the duly elected President of Georgia, and his reforms brought Georgia from a backward status in the world to a much improved financial structure, with marked increases in economic growth and foreign investment.

For all of Georgia's struggles, for all of her self-determination, outside neighbors once again are vying to make Georgia subservient to their wishes. Russia has been stung by free peoples in independent states that she once dominated in the Soviet era that now choose instead to preserve their language, culture, history, and restore their freedom.

Russia, for its part, has done everything in its power to force these peoples back into a serf status. Whether in Crimea, Ukraine, the Baltic States, or Georgia, the pattern has been the same.

Russia's playbook starts with flooding opposition groups with cash from oligarchs loyal to Moscow. Separatists are courted in areas with some Russian ethnicity and then encouraged to foment division against these struggling republics, demanding their rights for Russian peoples in these territories.

Russia then aids militias to create violence that strains the local political and law enforcement structure, causing the people living there to wish for anything—even the bad old days—to somehow restore order.

Then national political parties are infiltrated and flushed with oligarch cash and promises of power as they convert legitimate parliaments into calls for pro-Moscow governance that, in essence, become nothing more than the old Soviet Socialist structure ruled by Moscow.

In Georgia, it has been no different. Despite Georgia casting off outside invaders and attempting to push off the chains of Russia in the early 1800s or in

1918 or in 1991, Russia somehow feels it is her right to treat Georgians as a subclass of human beings that only exist to serve the interests of Moscow and her territory should only merely be a transitway for Russian interests.

After the successful removal of Russian chains in the Rose Revolution in 2003, Russia has continually bullied Georgia's political system, fomented unrest in Abkhazia and Ossetia, invaded Georgia, and violated her agreement to withdraw from bases in Georgian territory. Amazingly, through all of this, Georgia has remained resolute.

So, in classic form, Russia has moved to infiltrate the political process in the hopes of creating its own pro-Moscow government in the Georgian capital to hand them everything on a silver political platter.

Chief among the funding efforts and political infiltration is oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili, a close ally of Vladimir Putin. The aim is to rig votes along the same lines as was attempted in 2003 by buying votes, punishing political opponents, using Georgia's own administrative and political resources to influence the elections while using Georgian special forces to influence the outcomes.

Combined with the full privatization of the election commissions, who one source estimates is now 98 percent controlled by Ivanishvili, the Georgian people face an alarming prospect in their right to free elections in October of this year.

Faced with such bullying, the Georgian people are looking to the world for support. It is somehow fitting, Mr. Speaker, that this Saturday marks St. George's Day in world history.

St. George, the Christian martyr and mythical slayer of dragons, is the namesake from whom the country of Georgia takes its name, according to some legends.

The Georgian people are willing to slay this political dragon and stand for their freedom as they have before, but they need our help.

We can ignore their pleas—after all, most Americans don't even know where Georgia is on the map—or we can give them a megaphone to shout their message, and the message is this: They wish to remain free.

Here are some simple steps that we, in our country, can take: We call on the President of the United States to assist in monitoring of this fall's election processes in Georgia, as we once assisted them in the pivotal 2003 elections.

We call upon the Georgian electoral commissions to be restored to representative membership to counter the private buyout being conducted by Moscow and their proxy, oligarch Bidzina Ivanishvili.

We call upon the United States Department of Treasury and Western banks to freeze the assets of Ivanishvili for violations as an illegal arms trader.

We call upon the State Department to flag Georgian officials and business

leaders who are discovered to be complicit in tampering with free elections to have their visas revoked and their assets frozen.

We also call upon Western journalists in our free press to give the Georgian people a chance to have their story heard by investigating and covering the remaining few months of what could be the last free months of a Republic of Georgia.

Finally, we call upon the self-determined, free, and resolute people of Georgia to stand in the spirit of St. George.

Hold your head high, grasp the lance, and pierce the attacking dragon. You have been threatened before. By your commitment, as in 2003, you can show the world again that freedom will not succumb to corruption and intimidation.

The people of Georgia should also know the God of the universe does not slumber. We, the people of the United States, join with the people of Georgia in our prayers for your freedom.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back my time.

#### THE WEEK IN REVIEW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 6, 2015, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I so much appreciate my colleague and friend talking about the Georgia election. We should be encouraging fair elections everywhere and, when they are not fair, calling those to account.

Not that we are the policemen of the world, but it becomes so much more unfortunate when you have a nation like Egypt that gets pushed into elections before they are ready, the Muslim Brotherhood takes over the country, as in Egypt when Morsi became President.

He began shredding the Constitution and taking more and more power as it happened in Venezuela with Chavez and other countries. He had taken a lesson: This is the way you do it. You get elected, and then you start seizing more and more power.

To the credit of the Egyptian people, their story in recent years is the greatest peaceful uprising in the history of the world. It wasn't entirely peaceful because of the violence of the Muslim Brotherhood.

They want a world caliphate, and they want to start with something resembling the old Ottoman Empire, that caliphate that came around North Africa and on around the Mediterranean, and they need Egypt in order to make the beginning of the caliphate work.

And so they were quite happy when radical Islam, Muslim Brotherhood, took over Egypt through Morsi. But when the Egyptian people, a third of the population, basically—30 million or so of the 90 million there in the nation of Egypt—rose up together, yes, you had Muslims marching with Christians.

The Coptic Christian Pope himself has told me more than once how moving it was to have Muslims and Christians and Jews and secularists walking together through the streets in Egypt demanding an end to radical Islamic control, demanding that the President, who was constantly violating the Constitution, be removed.

The Coptic Pope told me that it was moving when Muslims, who just wanted peace in Egypt—they didn't want radical Islamic control—would come up to him and apologize for the way that Morsi and the Muslim Brotherhood and radical Islamists were acting.

And, yes, among Muslims, they are able to recognize that there is a part of Islam—the radical Islamists—that they don't like, but it is a part of Islam.

When the administration in this country tells the world that there is no such thing as radical Islam, then they are demeaning and degrading those courageous Muslims who stand up and say: We need to stop radical Islam within Muslims, within the Islamic movement. They actually do damage to the people who want to live in peace.

So we are grateful to the people of Egypt for stopping the caliphate before it could be really set in concrete around North Africa and, of course, Syria, all the way around. They want to get back to the old Ottoman Empire and spread and cover the world under the caliphate.

It is really most interesting. We have a President who went to elementary school in Muslim school and was trained in Islam in elementary school, and that is the main part of his training on Islam. Because, as we know, he sat under Jeremiah Wright's teaching in church for 20 years or so.

So the basic teaching on Islam was in elementary school, whereas there is the ultimate world expert on what is or is not Islam that most of the world recognizes.

They don't down the street here, down Pennsylvania Avenue. They don't at the State Department under Secretary Kerry. But most of the world recognizes that a man who got degrees, including his doctor of philosophy, his Ph.D., in Islamic studies from the University of Baghdad, is an expert on Islam.

He says radical Islam is Islam. He didn't just get a little elementary school training on Islam. He studied Islam his whole life, has a Ph.D. in Islamic studies, and has continued to pour himself into study of the Koran, and he happens to be the head of the Islamic State.

□ 1215

It would seem that if somebody who spent his life studying—rather than just studying Islam in elementary school—says the Islamic State is truly Islam, perhaps the so-called experts in our State Department and our White House ought to listen to that and take notice as well that perhaps maybe it is not as they have been saying, that it is

not Islam. It is Islam, but it is a part of Islam, the radical Islamists, and we should be standing against it.

So, again, the Iran treaty clearly is a treaty. It needs to be called for what it is: a treaty. And we need to have people in the Senate with courage to step up and say we need a vote on the Iran treaty, because it is a treaty. The Corker bill doesn't apply because it is a treaty. Take the vote. Two-thirds will not vote for it. It will not be confirmed. Then we can call the Iran treaty at an end, because it never was properly agreed to.

But in the meantime, since this administration put so much of what credibility it has on the table and at risk by backing the Iran deal, Iran—it may be the run-in leaders, their radical Islamic leaders, want to take over the world. They may be crazy in that regard, but they are very intelligent. You can be crazy and still be highly intelligent. That is how you can be crazy enough to fly a plane into a building and kill thousands of innocent people, but you are intelligent enough to have your engineers look at the plans and figure out what kind of load it would take to bring down a building like the World Trade Center.

An article by Joel Pollak from last year—this is last year—and he says: "In his State of the Union address" last year, "President Barack Obama claimed: 'Our diplomacy is at work with respect to Iran, where, for the first time in a decade, we've halted the progress of its nuclear program and reduced its stockpile of nuclear material. Between now and this spring, we have a chance to negotiate a comprehensive agreement that prevents a nuclear-armed Iran; secures America and our allies, including Israel; while avoiding yet another Middle East conflict.'"

Mr. Pollak's article says: "None of that is true. The chances of an agreement have dropped sharply, and even the most optimistic analysts do not expect a deal that 'prevents a nuclear-armed Iran,' but only one that puts nuclear 'breakout' out of reach for a while. Most important of all, we have not 'halted the progress' of Iran's nuclear program. Earlier this month, the Tehran regime announced that it was building two new reactors, and is thought to be behind a suspected facility planned in Syria as well.

"In a lengthy essay in *Commentary* magazine, the invaluable Omri Ceren summarizes the history of President Obama's appeasement of the Iranian's, from the first failed 'suckers deal,' as the French called it, through the new veto threats against congressional sanctions.

"The scale of the Obama administration's incompetence is simply daunting. Far from rallying international unity against Iran, President Obama has destroyed it by giving away global demands decades in the making.

"Suddenly, the reason for . . . invitation to Israeli Prime Minister Ben-

jamin Netanyahu to Congress—without consultation from the White House—becomes clear . . . it is not the pro-Israel nature of Congress that drove the Bibi"—Netanyahu—"invitation. It is the fact that Obama"—

Well, it says he misrepresented things, but that is this article.

But it goes on to point out that "there at least five ways in which Iran has explicitly violated the interim agreement" and spells those out.

This is over a year old. They have never stopped violating the agreement—not the interim agreement—they were violating it, the executive agreement that this President entered with Iran.

They so much sank their reputation into the Iran treaty that has not been ratified that these constant violations by Iran have the administration defending Iran, sending them money, covering for Iran, making excuses for Iran.

This article was from less than a year ago by Cory Bennett from *The Hill*: "A diplomatic deal with Iran to limit its nuclear program could inadvertently jumpstart the country's cyber warfare efforts.

"Experts say Tehran might use the economic sanctions relief from the nuclear pact to buttress its growing cyber program, which has already infiltrated critical networks in over a dozen countries, including the U.S."

So the article goes on to point out: "We are in a lose-lose situation."

It is clear to most of us that the Iranian agreement was a huge mistake. They are the largest state supporters of terrorism in the world, and this administration is ongoing right now in giving billions and billions of dollars.

And though the Iranian leaders have lied about so many things, when they say that the money that President Obama gives to them, which they don't currently have—the \$100 billion to \$150 billion in the first year, perhaps \$100 billion or so each year after that; it remains to be seen—their Iranian leaders say:

We are going to be able to fund more terrorist organizations.

That is a statement we should take seriously. That is something that we should believe when they tell us these things.

So the President is giving them the money. This article says this week that, of the \$3 billion that was recently provided to Iran, this administration can't really tell if they have used it to support additional terrorism or not.

But this article that was written in May of last year that the Iran deal could help fund Iran's cyber war, I bring that up now—it is from May 10 of last year from Mr. Bennett—because it was just in the last 4 or 5 months that John Hayward wrote the article: "Iran Hacks State Department Social Media Accounts."

We know they have hacked a New York dam Web site. They have explored defenses of the United States Government's Internet.

Mr. Speaker, it is interesting to look back and see that, wow, in May of last year, there were reporters that were warning that this deal with Iran may help them in their cyber warfare against us greater than we even know. Then we find out that this administration put a hold on charges against the Iranians that hacked into our government system until after the deal was made so that people didn't raise more of a fuss to try to stop the Iranian treaty.

Well, it is still not too late. The Senate could go ahead and take a vote. We know that HARRY REID had said:

Gee, there are some low-level confirmations that are so important to the country, we are going to set aside the cloture rule. It only takes 51 votes to do that.

Mr. Speaker, I would submit that this Iranian treaty—I keep saying it because it is so critical to the world and to any chance at a semblance of world peace—has to be stopped because it is enriching the largest supporter of terrorism in the world.

The Iranian leaders have made clear to the Iranian people that they have no intention of being bound by any agreement with President Obama, John Kerry, or the people here in the U.S. They are still going to do what they want to.

So all the Senate has to do is take a vote—51 votes; there are plenty of Republicans to do that—and they might just get some Democrats that are too afraid to be seen as supportive of Iran and this nuclear deal that they may get some Democrat votes. Vote with 51 votes to set aside the cloture rule so you can bring treaty to the floor, have a vote on confirmation—it won't get the two-thirds—and then you would have all kinds of people that should have standing to go into Federal court and put a stop to the billions of dollars that this administration is releasing illegally to Iran. That is, funding—this administration says they know not what—it could be terrorism, they are not sure. I would submit they would—Iran would be supporting terrorism.

But here are five things that the article pointed out that they were—even a year ago—breaking the interim agreement: “Trying to buy equipment for plutonium reactor at Arak, breaking commitment to suspend work. The Obama administration actually complained about the purchases to the U.N. Security Council, even as it told the world that Iran had ‘lived up to its end of the bargain.’”

They are “feeding uranium hexafluoride gas into a plant where it had agreed to suspend nuclear enrichment. The Institute for Science and International Security noted that Iran had begun enrichment at the Pilot Fuel Enrichment Plant at Natanz. It notified the Obama administration, which complained to the Iranians, which then claimed to have stop the enrichment activity.”

Three: “Withholding camera footage of nuclear facilities, defying the Inter-

national Atomic Energy Agency. A leading International Atomic Energy Agency official recently said the agency was ‘not in a position to provide credible assurance about the absence of undeclared nuclear material and activities in Iran’ . . . The interim deal was to provide surveillance footage of Iranian nuclear facilities, but Iran has only provided what it wants to reveal.”

And that is consistent with what STEVE KING and I and a couple of other Members were told by the IAEA inspectors who were in charge of inspecting Iran, that they can only go by what they are given. They are not given access to military facilities. They are not being given this footage.

I am very proud to yield to my dear friend from Kentucky (Mr. MASSIE), a proud graduate of MIT on the floor.

Mr. MASSIE. I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding to me.

This is a very interesting topic that you are speaking on, and I have never had the chance on the floor to explain my feelings on this vote nor the reason why I voted as I did on the Iran bill. So I appreciate the opportunity to say a little bit about this.

Mr. Speaker, it is my understanding that the gentleman from Texas is basically qualifying the Iran deal as a treaty, and I agree with that position. In fact, I believe I was the only Congressman to vote “present” on that bill. And the reason that I did vote “present”—I just wanted a chance to clarify this—is that I felt that it was a treaty.

I know a lot of us felt that way and we had different ways of dealing with that vote, but I voted “present” to indicate it was a treaty and that it really shouldn't have even been here in the House of Representatives.

□ 1230

According to the Constitution, only the Senate shall agree to the treaties, and not the House. We shouldn't really have a say in that. So I just wanted the opportunity, and I appreciate the gentleman from Texas giving me this opportunity, to explain the reason that I voted “present.” I think it was only the second time since I have been in Congress, and it was for a constitutional reason. I felt strongly that was a treaty.

I thank the gentleman from Texas for this opportunity.

Mr. GOHMERT. If the gentleman would hang on for a moment, I voted for the bill, but I did not feel like it adequately dealt with the issue that my friend from Kentucky raised, but I completely respect that position.

Since the gentleman from Kentucky and I have had a lot of discussions about Iran and the Iranian treaty and his feelings, I have always felt that his vote, “present,” made eminent sense, was consistent with our position.

Really, the vote on what we took didn't really matter so much as the point that the gentleman has just

made. This is a treaty. The Senate needs to vote on it. Our vote, though nice, was not particularly relevant to the fact that it is a treaty.

I would like to ask, if the gentleman would yield for a question, because I saw that there was a handsome young man in a blue shirt that came in with him, and wondered if he might identify who has accompanied him onto the floor.

Mr. MASSIE. As the gentleman from Texas knows, we are allowed to bring younger constituents and visitors, and we have a visitor from Kentucky; that is true. His name is Joe.

Mr. GOHMERT. I thought perhaps he might be from Kentucky.

Mr. MASSIE. His name is Joe.

Mr. GOHMERT. That is wonderful. He looks quite comfortable here on the floor, looks like he would be a good fit some day.

I thank my friend for making that point.

The vote that we took last year pointed out that the Iranians had not complied; the administration had not complied, as I recall, with the requirements to provide proper information.

But the gentleman from Kentucky is exactly right. The real issue was a vote in the Senate on it being a treaty. The Senate has not yet voted on the Iranian treaty as a treaty, and if they would do that, when it didn't get the two-thirds votes, then we could stop the outrage of sending billions of dollars to a country that has a massive amount of American, precious American blood on its hands because of the way in which they have funded terrorism.

They were the largest provider of IEDs when Americans were fighting for Muslim freedom in Iraq, and yet Iran continued to build and furnish IEDs. It needs to be dealt with. People are suffering in the world.

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned Egypt, and what a great day for world history when a third of the population rose up, 30 million people that had never risen up in the history of the world, in peaceful demonstration, despite the Muslim Brotherhood's violence to try to make it appear otherwise. They had never risen up like those people did in Egypt. They are to be commended.

I would humbly submit that if this administration would help Egypt and be the friend to Egypt that it is being in helping Iran and providing money to Iran, then the world would be a far better place than it is with all the help that this administration is providing to Iran.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind that the ultimate result of the Clinton, Wendy Sherman deal with North Korea, in which, in essence, the Clinton administration says: Hey, we will give you nuclear—we will let you have nuclear power. We will give you what you need to have if you will just sign and say you won't ever use it to develop nukes.

And then, big shocker for some in the Democratic administration—it wasn't

to most of us that were watching from afar in different places in the United States—North Korea lied. They did use what we provided to create nuclear weapons, and now the world is a much less safe place.

So I have no doubt that someday, maybe, some Iranian will kill me; but somebody will be here on the floor, if the Capitol still exists, and will point out that this deal that Obama and Kerry and Wendy Sherman did with Iran, in allowing them to move forward with nuclear activity, providing them with \$100 billion or so to start off, hundreds of billions in the future, that they ended up lying when they said they agreed, initially, to the agreement—even though they have said publicly: We are not going to abide by it—that they ended up using results from the Obama administration's treaty to develop nuclear weapons, and that, just like the Clinton-Albright-Sherman deal with North Korea, the Obama-Kerry-Sherman deal with Iran has resulted in Iran having nukes sooner than they would have otherwise, despite the promises previously by the Obama administration to prevent Iran from having nukes. Actually, they helped them get the nukes.

NORTH CAROLINA'S PASSAGE OF HOUSE BILL 2

Mr. GOHMERT. I want to turn to one other subject that has been very controversial—North Carolina has gotten a bad rap—and this article from ABC News, "North Carolina's Controversial 'Anti-LGBT' Bill Explained."

The article says: "Several civil rights groups and LGBTQ advocates are organizing a rally tonight in Raleigh"—this is from March 24 of this year—"North Carolina, to protest the State's controversial passage of its House Bill 2, which critics have called 'the most anti-LGBT bill in the country.'"

The article says: "Here's everything you need to know about the bill, also known as The Public Facilities Privacy and Security Act, which was signed into law by Governor Pat McCrory on Wednesday."

"What does it do?"

"House Bill 2 declares that State law overrides all local ordinances concerning wages, employment, and public accommodations."

"Thus, the law now bars local municipalities from creating their own rules prohibiting discrimination in public places based on sexual orientation and gender identity. Though North Carolina does have a statewide nondiscrimination law, it does not include specific protections for LGBTQ people."

We keep adding letters, you know. We kept adding letters until we got to LGBT, and now we have added Q.

"The law also directs all public schools, government agencies, and public college campuses to require that multiple-occupancy bathrooms and changing facilities, such as locker rooms, be designated for use only by people based on their 'biological sex' stated on their birth certificate."

Transgender people can use the bathrooms and changing facilities that correspond to their gender identity only if they get the biological sex on their birth certificate changed."

"Under the law, public institutions can still offer single-occupancy facilities."

And nobody has a problem with that. If you have got a single bathroom facility that has just got one facility for going to the bathroom, that is fine. It can be for whoever needs to use it.

But they are saying, as has been consistent with the history of the world for most of the world's existence, that if you, according to documentation, are a female, you use the female restroom when it is for multiple people's use at the same time; and if, by documentation, you are a male, you use the male facilities.

It has really been shocking to see how many people, including singers and entertainers and different groups—I understand Target now wants to make sure that boys can use girls restrooms as they please.

But it has been amazing that such people have been demanding that we have to let boys who want to go in little girls bathrooms go in there. If a man wants to go in a little girls bathroom, according to the big popular movement now, for heaven's sake, let's let the man go in the little girls bathroom.

North Carolina has taken action consistent with the position of the world since the world began. If you are going to have a multiple-use restroom, normally, you have a female go to a female multiuse restroom, a male go to a male multiuse restroom.

This article goes on. It says: "Republican lawmakers, who make up the majority of North Carolina's General Assembly, publicly unveiled the language of the bill Wednesday morning."

It goes on and talks about its passage: "In less than 12 hours"—I am talking about after its passage—"the bill was approved by the house and senate"—or after it was brought forward, the bill was passed, signed by the Governor.

Lawmakers in the House voted 83-25 to pass the bill. The Senate approved the bill, 32-0 after Democrats, who make up the minority, walked out of the Chamber in protest.

Obviously, they want men to go to little girls restrooms, too.

"Republicans and allies supporting the bill argued that it was necessary to protect the safety of women and children from 'radical' action by Charlotte."

"Critics of Charlotte's ordinance said it could have allowed men who may be sexual offenders to enter a woman's restroom or locker room by claiming a transgender identity."

Well, critics of the Charlotte ordinance is what the article says, but actually, that is not just a claim; that is a fact.

Under what North Carolina was objecting to, if someone who is a sexual

offender has decided he wants to go in and meddle in a little girls restroom where he has no business, people like the entertainer that doesn't want to go to North Carolina, they are saying, by golly, you have got to let that man go in that little girls restroom.

What has happened to the sense that used to be such a prominent part of this country?

I mean, there was a very intelligent man on Fox News, Bill O'Reilly, who actually asked a lawyer on a panel with him on the show: So they passed this law. They don't want men going into the women's restroom, basically, was the crux of it, or boys going in where little girls go. He asked the question, actually: Who are they trying to protect?

I couldn't believe that we have come to the point where an intelligent person would have to ask such a stupid question. Whether you agree or disagree with what North Carolina did, whom they were trying to protect, it is almost rhetorical. Clearly, whether you agree or disagree, they were trying to protect the little girls.

□ 1245

It is shocking that anybody would have to ask such a question: Gee, whom are they trying to protect by saying men can't go into girls' restrooms? Incredible. The outrage aimed at North Carolina has just been incredible.

I see an article today by Ryan Lovelace from the Washington Examiner: Trump slams North Carolina bathroom law, says state should "leave it the way it is."

The way, apparently, Charlotte was going to have it was that men could go in little girls' restrooms. Of course, sexual predators who are male, all they have to do is say they are transgender and they get to go in the little girls' restrooms and wreak the havoc that made them a sexual predator.

Whom are they trying to protect in North Carolina? They are trying to protect innocent kids who cannot protect themselves. They count on adults to keep them from harm. It is incredible that people are outraged at North Carolina.

Anyone who has children who are female, do you really want men to say: I am transgender and get to go in where your little girl is going to the bathroom, where you can't go because you are not transgender? You are the girl's father.

This article says "What Do Proponents of the Bill Argue?" It says: "Republicans and allies supporting the bill argued that it was necessary to protect the safety of women and children from 'radical' action by Charlotte."

"John Rustin, president of the North Carolina Family Policy Council, testified before the Senate, saying that the Charlotte ordinance 'means men could enter women restrooms and locker rooms—placing the privacy, safety, and

dignity of women and the elderly at great risk.”

Parenthetically, I noticed an article in recent days, last week, that indicated that one of the leading colleges in pushing for transgender restrooms has had a problem—and it has come up a couple of times—where men would come in where women were showering, go into the restroom and use their cell phone, hold it up over the stall so they can film or take pictures of the female who was trying to have some privacy in a very personal act of showering or going to the bathroom.

What is wrong with saying: Do you know what? When it comes to going to the restroom, females will go to female, males will go to male, and, look, if you want to have a single facility for one person at a time to use or families to use to change diapers or whatever, those are really handy? Those are very helpful. My wife and I have used them ourselves raising girls. It is a handy thing to have.

But why condemn North Carolina when they are just trying to protect the privacy of girls? It has already been shown that, if you give guys a chance to say: I am transgender, and I can get to go in and film a girl in a shower, there will be people that do that.

Why not let the transgender LGBTQ—whatever the initials are—let them have their activities where they don't impose upon the privacy of someone who wants to go to the restroom or shower without someone from the opposite sex being there with them?

Governor McCrory wrote this statement: “The basic expectation of privacy in the most personal of settings, a restroom or locker room, for each gender was violated by government overreach and intrusion by the mayor and city council of Charlotte . . . As a result, I have signed legislation passed by a bipartisan majority to stop this breach of basic privacy and etiquette which was to go into effect April 1.”

Mr. Speaker, I mentioned that I understand Target may now be changing their restrooms. I will have to double-check because, if they are going to be having women come to men's restrooms, I won't be going to Target to shop unless and until that changes.

Usually, Target is great. They have the restroom right there where you go in the door to the store, normally. You don't have to go clear to the back of the store. It is a handy thing.

If you have to go shopping, it is handy, but not anymore. Anybody that wants to go to the restroom and have privacy from the opposite sex may need to shop elsewhere. We will have to look at what they have actually done.

Anyway, this article seems to make the point that it is not such a crazy thing that North Carolina has done, and that is why for 99.999 percent of human history, since civilization exists since we got past the caveman era, when there have been public restrooms,

you recognize there is a difference between males and females.

Some day it will be written in the “Rise and Fall of the United States” that the greatest, freest, and most powerful country in the history of the world showed symptoms of insanity when it reached the pinnacle of its greatness and success—and this will be one of the symptoms that was written about—that they thought they were so much smarter than civilization for most of our history of the world that a difference was recognized between men and women for purposes of facilities. It is a sad day for the country.

Now, I see this article from yesterday that Curt Schilling, an ESPN analyst, was fired over what they deemed as an offensive social media post. Here is what Schilling said:

The post showed an overweight man wearing a wig and women's clothing with parts of the T-shirt cut out to expose his chest. It says, “Let him into the restroom with your daughter or else you are a narrow-minded, judgmental, unloving racist bigot who needs to die.”

Apparently, this kind of thing offends ESPN. Although at one time their job was covering sports, now their job is being social managers, apparently, in making sure that, if men want to go to little girls' restrooms, then we let the men go to little girls' restrooms.

This article from yesterday talking about Target stores says: “Target says transgender customers may use the bathroom of the gender with which they identify.”

How about that. Et tu, Target?

So here we are at the place in our history where insanity in the name of political correctness rules the day, common sense is no longer common, and to the point that the current leader in the Republican campaign for President even says that North Carolina should not have taken action that, in essence, says men—which would include sexual predators—should not be allowed to go in women's restrooms. He wanted it left like it was.

So if Charlotte wants to say that, if you are a man and you are a sexual predator and you say you are transgender and want to go into the restroom where little girls are, go ahead.

That is the position of the leading Republican candidate? I don't know. Hopefully, that will be another one of the positions he will change.

But, in the meantime, we need to get common sense back in charge in America while we are still the great country we have been.

Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). Members are reminded not to make reference to guests on the floor of the House.

## EXPENDITURES BY THE OFFICE OF GENERAL COUNSEL UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 676, 113TH CONGRESS

COMMITTEE ON HOUSE ADMINISTRATION, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, April 21, 2016.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,  
Speaker, U.S. House of Representatives,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to section 3(b) of H. Res. 676 of the 113th Congress, as continued by section 3(f)(2) of H. Res. 5 of the 114th Congress, I write with the following enclosure which is a statement of the aggregate amount expended on outside counsel and other experts on any civil action authorized by H. Res. 676.

Sincerely,

CANDICE S. MILLER,  
Chairman.

### AGGREGATE AMOUNT EXPENDED ON OUTSIDE COUNSEL OR OTHER EXPERTS (H. Res. 676)

July 1–September 30, 2014 .....	\$0.00
October 1–December 31, 2014 .....	42,875.00
January 1–March 31, 2015 .....	50,000.00
April 1, 2015–June 30, 2015 .....	29,915.00
July 1–September 30, 2015 .....	21,000.00
October 1–December 31, 2015 .....	45,707.67
January 1–March 31, 2016 .....	15,124.00
<b>Total .....</b>	<b>204,664.34</b>

### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 55 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, April 25, 2016, at 11:30 a.m.

### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5103. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Personnel and Readiness, Office of the Under Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a report entitled “2013 Workplace and Equal Opportunity Survey of Active Duty Members: Overview Report”, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 481(e); Public Law 103-337, Sec. 554(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 107-314, Sec. 561(a)(1)); (116 Stat. 2554); ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5104. A letter from the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Legislative Affairs, Department of Defense, transmitting additional legislative proposals that the Department of Defense requests be enacted during the second session of the 114th Congress; to the Committee on Armed Services.

5105. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Final Flood Elevation Determinations; Morehouse Parish, Louisiana, and Incorporated Areas [Docket ID: FEMA-2016-0002] received April 19, 2016, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Added by Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

5106. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — National Flood Insurance Program: Update To Address Information for Claims Appeals